

REMARKS

Applicants appreciate the courtesy of Examiner Garcia for agreeing to a telephone interview with Applicants' representative on May 18, 2007. During the telephone interview, Applicants' representative described the Applicants' claimed invention and distinguished the claimed invention from the prior art, in particular, the Nakagawa reference. Applicants' representative proposed amending independent claims 1 and 14 to recite that the verifying step or verification is carried out entirely in the electronic apparatus. Independent claims 1 and 14 have been amended herein in the manner proposed during the telephone interview.

Claims 1-26 are pending in the application. Claims 20, 25, and 26 are allowed. Claims 1 and 14 have been amended by the present amendment. The amendments are fully supported by the application as originally filed (see, e.g., specification at page 14, lines 5-12).

As amended, independent claims 1 and 14 recite a method for managing at least one electronic apparatus and an electronic apparatus, respectively, in which verification of identification information of a portable terminal is carried out entirely in the electronic apparatus.

Claims 1-19 and 21-24 were rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 5,950,148 to Nakagawa et al. ("Nakagawa"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Nakagawa does not teach or suggest a method for managing at least one electronic apparatus or an electronic apparatus in which verification of identification information of a portable terminal is carried out entirely in the electronic apparatus.

In Nakagawa, a control part 20 of the copying machine 1 includes a CPU 21 provided with a memory 22, where various input and output devices are connected to the CPU 21 (see column 9, lines 31-38).

However, there is no teaching or suggestion in Nakagawa that the CPU 21 of the copying machine 1 is capable of verifying identification information of a portable terminal, as recited in independent claims 1 and 14.

Instead, in Nakagawa, the copying machine 1 must transmit identification data to a host computer 40, and the host computer 40 receives the identification data and determines appropriate data to transmit back to the copying machine 1 (see column 11, lines 35-49). In other words, "verification" occurs in the host computer 40, and the copying machine 1 merely serves as a conduit for transmitting and receiving information.

Thus, there is no teaching or suggestion in Nakagawa of an electronic apparatus or method for managing an electronic apparatus in which verification of identification information of a portable terminal is carried out entirely in the electronic apparatus.

For at least the reasons discussed above, the Nakagawa reference does not anticipate or otherwise render obvious the Applicants' claimed invention. Therefore, independent claims 1 and 14, and their respective dependent claims are allowable over Nakagawa.

It is believed that the claims are in condition for immediate allowance, which action is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

/Steven M. Jensen/

Steven M. Jensen
(Reg. No. 42,693)
Edwards Angell Palmer & Dodge
P.O. Box 55874
Boston, MA 02205

Date: May 29, 2007

Phone: (617) 439-4444

Customer No. 21874